

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 27, 2005 in which Claims 1-6, 11-14, 17, 26, 27, 33-37 and 39-43 were allowed; and in which Claims 7-10, 15, 16, 18-25, 28-32, 44 and 45 were rejected. With this response, Claims 16 and 17 are cancelled and Claims 7-10, 15, 21-22, 28-29, 31, 32 and 39 are amended. Claims 1-15, 18-37 and 39-45 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Objection to the Drawings.

Objection to the Specification.

Rejection of Claims 7-10, 21, 22, 28, 29, 30 and 45 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action objected to the drawings asserting that the "power pod" recited in Claims 7-10, 21, 22, 28, 29, 30 and 45 is not shown. Paragraph 3 of the Office Action objected to the specification by asserting that the "power pod" recited in the claims has not been described in the specification. Paragraph 5 of the Office Action rejected Claims 7-10, 21, 22, 28, 29, 30 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, by asserting that the "power pod" recited in the claims are not described in the specification. In response, Claims 7-10, 21, 22, 28, 29 and 45 are amended to replace the term "power pod" with the term --power supply-- which is shown in the drawings (see power supply 237), which is enabled and described in the specification. Accordingly, Claims 7-10, 21, 22, 28, 29, 30, and 45, as amended, overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants further request that the objection to the specification and drawings also be withdrawn in light of these amendments.

II. Claim Objections.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action objected to Claim 39 noting that Claim 39 depends from Claim 38 which has been cancelled. Claim 39 is amended to correctly

depend from Claim 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to Claim 39 be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 15-16, 18-20, 23-25, 31-32 and 44 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Based Upon Meyer.

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action rejected Claims 15-16, 18-20, 23-25, 31-32 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Meyer et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0057907. Claims 16 and 17 are cancelled. Claims 15, 18-20, 23-25, 31-32 and 44, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Meyer.

A. Claim 15.

Paragraph 9 of the Office Action indicated that Claim 17 recites allowable subject matter. In response, Claim 17 and intervening Claim 16 are cancelled with the indicated allowable subject matter of Claim 17 incorporated into rejected Claim 15. Thus, Claim 15, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Meyer. Claims 18-20, 23-25 and 44 depend from Claim 15 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claim 31.

Claim 31, as amended, recites a computing system which includes a first connector portion electrically connected to a circuit board and an electronic component having a first end and a second end and including an electronic device, a second connector portion electrically connected to an electronic device and electrically connected to the first connector portion along a first axis closer to the first end and the second end. The component further includes means on opposite sides of the axis for resiliently supporting the second end relative to the circuit board as the first connector portion is being connected to the second connector portion.

Meyer fails to disclose means on opposite sides of an axis for resiliently supporting a second end of an electronic component relative to a circuit board as the first connector portion is being connected to the second connector portion. In

contrast, connector portion 226 of Meyer is not connected to connector portion 228 along an axis that is closer to a first end of component 224 as compared to the second opposite end of component 224. Alignment members 30 and 32 (shown in Figures 1-3) are not located on opposite sides of the axis along which connector portions 26 and 28 are connected to one another. Accordingly, Claim 31, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Meyer.

C. Claim 32.

Claim 32, as amended, recites a method for connecting an electronic component having a first end, an opposite second end, an electronic device and a first connector portion closer to the first end than the second end, to a circuit board having a second connector portion. The method includes substantially aligning the first connector portion with the second connector portion along an axis and resiliently supporting the second end as the first connector portion is moved in interconnection with the second connector portion with a plurality of resilient support members asymmetrically located about the axis.

As apparently acknowledged by the already indicated allowability of Claim 1, Meyer fails to disclose a plurality of resilient support members asymmetrically located about the axis along which the first connector portion is connected to the second connector portion. Accordingly, Meyer also does not disclose resiliently supporting the second end of the electronic component as the first connector portion is moved into interconnection with the second connector portion with a plurality of resilient support members asymmetrically located about the axis. Thus, Claim 32, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Meyer.

IV. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-15, 18-37 and 39-45 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Dec. 27, 2005

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22879
Telephone: (414) 297-5710
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276